

**HON'BLE SHRI G.S.SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
AND  
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY**

-  
**Writ Petition No.26904 of 2006**

Between

Dr.Syed Raza Mehdi

-

..Petitioner

AND

The Special Commissioner, Information and Public ..Respondents  
Relations, Hyderabad and others

-

**:: JUDGMENT ::**

Counsel for the petitioner

-

Sri M.V.Satya Prasad for Sri  
P.Saimangapathy

Counsel for respondent Nos.1  
to 3

Government Pleader for Information  
and Public Relations

Counsel for respondent No.4

Sri M.Vijay Kumar

**27.12.2006**

**Per G.S.Singhvi, CJ.**

In this petition filed as public interest litigation, Dr. Syed Raza Mehdi, who has described himself as a journalist, has prayed for issue of a direction to official respondents to order an independent enquiry through the State Police in the matter of alleged illegal appointment of respondent No.4 – A.L.Kismath Kumar as District Public Relation Officer and take further action in the matter.

In the affidavit filed by him, the petitioner has referred to G.O.Ms.No. 886, dated 11.6.1996 whereby the State Government prescribed the qualifications for the post of District Public Relation Officer and pleaded that even though respondent No. 4 was not possessing the prescribed qualification, he succeeded in getting himself selected by producing fake certificate regarding his experience. Along with the affidavit, the petitioner has annexed copy of letter dated 11.8.2005 sent by Secretary, Bar Council of State of Andhra Pradesh to Sri V. Subhash, Joint Director, Information Department to show that respondent No. 4 was enrolled as an Advocate on 8.4.1982 and he got enrolment suspended on 25.9.1984.

Sri M.V.Satya Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner argued that respondent No. 4 did not have five years experience in plan publicity or information and public relation and, as such, he was not eligible to be appointed as District Public Relation Officer, but he manipulated his selection by producing fake experience certificate. Learned counsel strongly relied on certificate dated 11.8.2005 and argued that a person, who was enrolled as Advocate, could not claim experience in plan publicity or information and public relations. Learned counsel pointed out that respondent No.4 was enrolled as an

Advocate with the Bar Council of the State of Andhra Pradesh on 8.4.1982 and got the same suspended on 25.9.1984 and, therefore, he could not have been treated eligible for recruitment as District Public Relation Officer in the year 1984.

We have considered the submissions of the learned counsel, but have not felt persuaded to entertain the writ petition. Rather, we are convinced that the writ petition is liable to be dismissed summarily because:

- i) The petitioner has not produced any tangible evidence before the Court to show that respondent No.4 had secured appointment to the post of District Public Relation Officer in the year 1984 by producing fake certificate. He has not even bothered to produce the order by which respondent NO.4 was appointed as District Public Relation Officer in the year 1984.
- ii) The petitioner has not explained the long gap of 22 years between the appointment of respondent No.4 as District Public Relation Officer and filing of this petition. He claims to be an experienced journalist of 30 years standing. If that be so, it is difficult to comprehend as to how he could be oblivious of the alleged irregularity in the appointment of respondent No.4 in 1984 in the department with which the petitioner is directly concerned. Indeed, it is neither the pleaded case of the petitioner nor the learned counsel has argued that the petitioner was practising journalism outside the State of Andhra Pradesh till 2005 and he acquired knowledge about the alleged irregularity in the appointment of respondent No.4 only in the year 2005.
- iii) It appears to us that the petitioner has filed this petition as

a shadow litigation on behalf of the competitor of respondent No.4 who could not get the appointment to the post of Director, Public Relations, Andhra Pradesh. This inference is being drawn by us because the certificate produced by the petitioner as exhibit P.3 is a copy of communication sent by the Secretary, Bar Council of the State of Andhra Pradesh to V.Subhash, Joint Director, Information Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad. The petitioner has not shown his nexus or connection with V.Subash. It is therefore reasonable to infer that the present writ petition has been filed for espousing the cause of the person who may not have been able to get him promoted to the post of Director of Information.

With the above observations, the writ petition is dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the writ petition, W.P.M.P.No.34569 of 2006 filed by the petitioner for interim relief is also dismissed.

**G.S.SINGHVI, CJ**

**C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J**

27-12-2006

psr